

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

EDWARD JAMES HILLS,

Plaintiff,

v.

THOMAS DICKSON and DICKSON
LAW GROUP PS,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:24-cv-2141-JNW

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

The Court raises this matter on its own accord. Plaintiff Edward James Hills sues Defendants Thomas Dickson and Dickson Law Group, PS, alleging breach of contract and embezzlement of trust funds. Dkt. No. 6 at 1. Hills pleads federal question subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331. *Id.* at 2.

Federal district courts have original jurisdiction in actions “arising under the Constitution, law, or treaties of the United States.” 28 U.S.C. § 1331. Hills does not allege a claim arising under federal law—his breach of contract and embezzlement claims against Dickson and Dickson Law Group PS sound exclusively in state law.

See generally Dkt. No. 6.

1 Federal district courts also have diversity jurisdiction in civil actions between
2 “citizens of different States[.]” “where the matter in controversy exceeds . . .
3 \$75,000[.]” 28 U.S.C. § 1332. Here, the parties are not diverse because Hills,
4 Dickson, and Dickson Law Group PS are all citizens of Washington. Dkt. No. 6 at 2.

5 After reviewing the complaint, the Court finds that Hills has failed to
6 establish subject matter jurisdiction. Accordingly, the Court ORDERS Hills to show
7 cause no later than 30 days from the date of this Order why this action should not
8 be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Failure to timely respond to this
9 Order will result in dismissal.

10 Dated this 14th day of January, 2025.

11
12 

13 Jamal N. Whitehead
14 United States District Judge
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23